

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated March 1, 2007 and the Advisory Action dated September 18, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-35 are currently pending, of which claims 4, 5, 7-14, 18, 19, 21-28, 33, and 34 are withdrawn from consideration. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interview of October 23, 2007. Applicants respectfully request consideration of the discussion of the interview and the below comments. Specifically to address the arguments regarding the “bracket having a projecting part.”

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected: claims 1-3, 6, 15-17, 20, 29-32, and 35 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of Yun et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,835,139, herein referred to as “Yun ‘139”); claims 1-3, 6, 15-17, 20, 29-32, and 35 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-65 of Yun et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,926,237, herein referred to as “Yun ‘237”); claims 1-3, 6, 15-17, 20, 29-32, and 35 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of Yun et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,373,537, herein referred to as “Yun ‘537”); and claims 1-3, 6, 15-17, 20, 29-32, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Masanori (JP Patent Pub. No. 07-099394).

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 15-17, 20, 29-32, and 35 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over various claims of Yun ‘139, Yun ‘237, and Yun ‘537, Applicants will address the filing of a terminal disclaimer when the Examiner indicates that the claims are otherwise allowable.

The rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 15-17, 20, 29-32, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masanori is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is respectfully

requested. As set forth at M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, the applied reference must teach or suggest every claim element to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Nevertheless, the Examiner apparently rejects claims 1, 15, 29, and 30 as obvious in view of Masanori because Masanori discloses “a liquid crystal panel 2 including a display area; first and second frames coupled to sides and edges of the liquid crystal panel; an outer casing disposed on the liquid crystal panel; the edges including a plurality of mounting holes, wherein the holes receives [sic] fastening screws.” Further, the Examiner proceeds to state:

Fastening means such as unthread fasteners, screws are common and known in the art. Further, the employment of such fastening means such as brackets would have been at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for yielding advantages such as improved-securing means so as housing elements within the display device are tightly-secured. Therefore, it would have been at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ fastening means such as brackets for yielding advantages such as improving securing means so as housing elements within the display device are tightly-secured.

It would seem that the Examiner is taking Official Notice regarding the bracket found in the present invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide documentary evidence to support the assertion of Official Notice. Further, all the Examiner has stated is that the use of a bracket would be obvious. The Examiner has ignored the fact that the bracket has a specific claimed structure that includes a protrusion or projecting part. No where is this addressed in the rejection.

Further, Applicants respectfully traverse the Finality of the March 1, 2007 Office Action. The Office Action is the result of arguments filed with an Request for Continued Examination. Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner has failed to fully address all of the issues raised by the Applicants, so the Finality of the present Office Action is not proper.

Further, Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner is addressing features in the Office Action that are not even found in the claimed invention. For example, fastening screws and mounting holes are not found at all in any of the claims of the present invention.

As shown above, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 1, 15, 29, and 30. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit the Examiner has also failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 2, 3, 6, 16, 17, 20, 31, 32, and 35, which variously depend from claims 1, 15, 29, and 30.


Applicants believe the foregoing remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: **14 November 2007**

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Eric J. Nuss

Registration No.: 40,106
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant